

From: [KENT Mavis D](#)
To: [Shaw, Steve M.](#)
Cc: [\(b\) \(6\)](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Dennis/CVO Shelton \(E-mail\)](#); [Scott/PDX Dethloff \(E-mail\)](#)
Subject: RE: Surface Soil
Date: 09/12/2005 07:18 AM

DEQ is willing to accept one foot.

Mavis D. Kent
Cleanup & Emergency Response Section
DEQ Northwest Region - East Side Office
1550 NW Eastman Parkway, Suite 290
Gresham, Oregon 97030
503-667-8414 X55008
503-674-5148 Fax
kent.mavis.d@deq.state.or.us

-----Original Message-----

From: Shaw, Steve M. [<mailto:Steve.Shaw@Alcoa.com>]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2005 9:18 AM
To: KENT Mavis D
Cc: Paul Seidel; 'Chip Humphrey/EPA10' (E-mail); Dennis/CVO Shelton (E-mail); Scott/PDX Dethloff (E-mail)
Subject: RE: Surface Soil

Mavis,

Any news regarding the appropriate depth we should consider as surface soils for human health risk assessment, i.e. 0-1 foot or 0-3 feet?

-----Original Message-----

From: Shaw, Steve M.
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 1:39 PM
To: 'KENT Mavis D'
Cc: Paul Seidel; 'Chip Humphrey/EPA10' (E-mail); Dennis/CVO Shelton (E-mail); Scott/PDX Dethloff (E-mail)
Subject: RE: Surface Soil

Mavis,

Our rationale for 1 foot was originally to be more consistent with the BLRA, but can easily shift to 3-ft based on DEQs newest guidance and on the Port's suggestion.

-----Original Message-----

From: KENT Mavis D [<mailto:KENT.Mavis@deq.state.or.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 10:24 AM
To: Shaw, Steve M.
Cc: Paul Seidel; 'Chip Humphrey/EPA10' (E-mail)
Subject: Surface Soil

Steve, we normally consider surface soil, at least for ecological receptors, to be 3 feet. It would help us if you could explain what your rationale is for using 1 foot. Then we could get back to you and discuss it with you. Thanks.

Mavis D. Kent
Cleanup & Emergency Response Section
DEQ Northwest Region - East Side Office
1550 NW Eastman Parkway, Suite 290
Gresham, Oregon 97030
503-667-8414 X55008
503-674-5148 Fax
kent.mavis.d@deq.state.or.us

